



Meeting Date: May 9, 2013
Meeting Time: 1:00 – 3:00 pm
Location: Kingman City Council Chambers; 310 N. 4th Street
Subject: TAC Progress Meeting Minutes
Kingman, Stockton Hill Road Corridor Study
Attendees: See Sign In Sheet
Prepared By: Becky Fly

1. Meeting Purpose:

- The purpose of Part 1 of the meeting was to review Working Paper #1 and resolve any comments from the TAC.
- Part 2 was a workshop to discuss next steps for Working Paper # 2, including a review of project goals, identified deficiencies, and evaluation criteria to compare potential solutions.
- Part 3 included a demonstration and discussion of potential reconfigurations of the Beverly/ Stockton Hill intersection using video simulations
- Part 4 was a presentation on the long term linkages of land use and transportation, including a discussion and activity on potential design and development policy concepts
- The meeting also included a discussion about the upcoming meeting with the public

Note: the following handouts have been attached to these meeting minutes:

- ❖ *PowerPoint slides from the TAC Progress meeting*
- ❖ *List of Attendees*

2. PART 1: Review of Working Paper #1 & Comment Resolution (1:00-1:40)

- Working Paper #1: The major elements and findings of the report were discussed and summarized as follows:
 - Summary of Previous Studies
 - City General Plan
 - KATS
 - 1999 Stockton Hill Road Traffic Interchange DCR
 - Pedestrian and Bikeway Plan
 - County General Plan
 - Data Collection
 - Socioeconomic Data
 - Transportation Network
 - Development Framework
 - Corridor Constraints
 - Existing Conditions
 - Employment Density
 - Population Density
 - Activity Centers
 - Access Management
 - Mobility Challenges
 - Design Challenges
 - Traffic Conditions
 - Future Conditions
 - Population Projections



- Employment Projections
- Character and Urban Form
- Traffic Conditions
- Comment Resolution/Discussion:
 - Comment of access management graphic being difficult to see.
 - Greg Henry (City of Kingman) noted that the access management graphic (Figure 13), which shows driveways, was difficult to read and suggested splitting it into multiple sub-areas.
 - *RESPONSE: Explained that intention of the graphic was to show the general concentrations of access ways along the corridor, and was not meant as a means to identify individual driveways.*
 - Comment on missing items from comment review form.
 - Burley Hambrick (City of Kingman) commented that his comments were missing from the comment review form, and that the following items should be included in the report and review form:
 - An additional multi-use path included as part of the non-motorized inventory, located parallel to I-40 and south of ADOT ROW along the drainage corridor.
 - Information on total crashes
 - References to "Navajo County" corrected to Mohave County
 - Updated information on KART bus services and fares
 - *RESPONSE: Acknowledged that the working paper will be revised to include all the items listed above.*
 - Comment on source of employment numbers.
 - Frank Marbury (City of Kingman) asked what the source of the employment projections were.
 - *RESPONSE: Explained that both existing and projected population and employment numbers originated from the model used for the 2011 KATS study, and that corridor specific numbers were captured from the TAZ zones generally encompassing the Stockton Hill study area.*
 - Comment on general traffic patterns and attractors.
 - Rob Owen (City of Kingman) commented that he considers northbound traffic to be worse overall compared to southbound, and that Walmart and the KRMC are the two most significant traffic generators.
 - *RESPONSE: Ensured that both considerations will be noted in the working paper and considered further throughout the study.*
 - Comment on recommended and programmed improvements.
 - Greg Henry (City of Kingman) explained that the future transportation section should include the partially funded Glen Rd. improvements.
 - *RESPONSE: Acknowledged that the Glen Rd. project and any other recently funded projects will be included in the report.*
 - Comment on functional classes.
 - Sharon Mitchell (WACOG) explained that Stockton Hill Road is officially considered a "Minor Arterial" and that identifying it incorrectly could have impacts on potential funding.



- *RESPONSE: Ensured that language in working paper will be revised in order to properly identify the functional class, and that changes to functional classifications could be evaluated and included as recommendations as part of the study.*
- Comment on recommended and programmed improvements.
 - Greg Henry (City of Kingman) explained that the future transportation section should include the partially funded Glen Rd. improvements.
 - *RESPONSE: Acknowledged that the Glen Rd. project and any other recently funded projects will be included in the report.*
- Comment on signal prioritization.
 - Greg Henry (City of Kingman) commented that multiple 4-leg intersections identified as part of the traffic volume information in the working paper are actually 3-leg intersections with private drives, and that these should be held as a lower priority for potential signalization if compared against “true 4-leg intersections” made up of two public roads.
 - *RESPONSE: Explained that the module used to generate traffic volumes considers a 3-leg with private drive intersection and “true” 4-leg intersection as the same thing for modeling purposes, but acknowledged that the difference in configuration could be considered when developing evaluation criteria.*

ACTION ITEMS: (PB Team tasks)

- ✓ *Revise Working Paper #1 to incorporate all appropriate TAC review comments*
- ✓ *Consider changes to road functional classes and the 3-leg with private drive intersection vs. 4-leg intersection question as potential factors for project prioritization*

3. PART 2: Evaluation Criteria Workshop (1:40-2:20)

In order to solicit input from the TAC members on what evaluation criteria should be used to compare and rank possible solutions to issues within the corridor; attendees were lead through a review of previously identified goals, issues, and possible opportunities. A group workshop was then held to identify and prioritize evaluation criteria.

The following goals were reviewed, based on input from the TAC Kickoff Meeting:

- Safety – Reduce Accidents
- Ensure capacity
- Maintain efficiency of the corridor
 - Traffic perspective
- Overall aesthetics
- Limit/ improve environmental impact
- Limit/ improve drainage issues
- Improve multimodal options
- Improve development patterns
- Improve access management

In addition, corridor issues were reviewed to assist in framing possible evaluation criteria. Issues were identified previously by the TAC or identified as part of the existing and future conditions working paper.

- Traffic Operations
 - Synchronization
 - Progression
 - Clearance Times
- Undefined Access Control



- Access Control Guidelines
 - Driveway Spacing
- Parking Lot Connectivity
- Development Policies
 - Setback
 - Parking
 - Pedestrian connections
- Lack of Bicycle/ Pedestrian Facilities
- Beverly Avenue
- Safety
- Circulation

Based on identified goals and issues, as well as findings drawn from Working Paper #1, a list of preliminary opportunities was developed for the corridor by the PB team. It is recognized that issues of the corridor are complex, and that opportunities to address challenges fall into three general categories.

- Transportation
 - Traffic
 - Access
 - Signalization
 - Parking – number of spaces
 - Connectivity
 - Network
 - Capacity – turn lanes
 - Intersection
- Land Use
 - Development pattern
 - Connectivity between uses
 - Retail / Hospital
- Economic Development
 - Economic utilization
 - Value capture
 - Densification

To help identify appropriate evaluation criteria to compare and rank solutions to corridor issues, the TAC was split into 2 groups, matched with a PB team facilitator, and provided a white-board. The TAC was then prompted to brainstorm and list possible evaluation criteria. The following is a summarized list of possible evaluation criteria reported by the TAC:

- Constraints
 - ROW availability
 - Public support from stakeholders
- Traffic
 - Access management impact
 - LOS impact
- Financial
 - Cost/ benefit comparison
 - Funding availability
- Safety
 - Crash reduction potential
 - Non-motorized safety impact



4. PART 3: Beverly Intersection Discussion (2:20-2:35)

The intersection of Beverly Avenue and Stockton Hill Road is of particular concern to the TAC and the PB team, based on significant traffic challenges caused by its proximity to I-40, turn limitations, and resulting cut-through traffic across an adjacent private parking lot. An update was given to the TAC on findings from a 2000 ADOT Roundabout Feasibility study, as well as four preliminary design recommendations for the intersection developed by the PB team. The four design concepts were shown using video simulations.

Major findings of the 2000 ADOT memo were summarized and presented to the TAC as follows:

- Constraints surrounding the intersection were found to have adequate geometry to meet modern roundabout standards
- Roundabout interchanges have been shown to work well at locations with closely spaced frontage roads
- Low traffic volumes existed on I-40 off ramp and Beverly Avenue.
- High volumes of through traffic would inhibit merging movement for traffic from off-ramp and Beverly Avenue.
- Roundabout option was not recommended, although the overall impact of unsafe movements was not discussed.

The following four preliminary intersection design concepts were presented to the TAC: [\(graphic overviews of each concept can be seen in the PowerPoint slide handouts\)](#)

- Alternative 1: Roundabout
- Alternative 2: Elongated Roundabout
- Alternative 3: Moved Ramp Terminus (relocating the I-40 W off-ramp further east along Beverly Ave).
- Alternative 4: Signal Controller with Lane Addition

Comments from TAC:

- Rob Owen (City of Kingman) commented that the best approach would be to reconfigure the off-ramps.
- Ken Paetz (ADOT Regional Traffic) made the following comments
 - Alternative 4 (Adding a signal) did not work in the past, and was removed only a few months after installation.
 - The signal south of Detroit Ave. creates a major bottleneck.
 - A variation of Alternative 2, with two elongated roundabouts (north and south of I-40), should be analyzed.
 - An option similar to Alternative 3 was denied in the past by FHWA, due to concerns about queuing back onto I-40.

5. PART 4: Land Use/Transportation Discussion (2:35-2:55)

In order to generate ideas and solicit input from the TAC members on longer-term solutions to issues along the corridor, a presentation was given on the long term linkages between land development policies and transportation impacts.

- The TAC was initially lead through a review of the approach followed by the City of Andover, Kansas, which was previously covered during the TAC Kickoff Meeting.
- A preliminary concept for the reconfiguration of Stockton Hill development policies was then shared with the TAC, in order to serve as an example of one possible long-term solution that could have beneficial impacts to the corridor.
- At the conclusion of the presentation, TAC members were provided maps of the corridor in order to sketch out their own ideas for development concepts.



The preliminary concept for the Stockton Hill corridor shared with the TAC included a walk-through of the following progression: (Graphic overviews of the development process can be seen in the PowerPoint slide handouts)

1. The current state of the corridor, characterized by single-purpose land uses, automobile-orientation, big-box retailers, and large undeveloped parcels
 2. The development of a street network using secondary routes and backage roads including Glen Ave. and Western Ave. in order to relieve Stockton Hill Road
 3. The creation of smaller block sizes based on existing property lines and parcel reassembly
 4. Reoriented building entrances resulting from changed setback requirements and façade treatments
 5. The creation of a future land-use scheme stemming from mixed-use zones, increased density, reduced parking requirements, and the preservation of the commercial core.
- Frank Marbury (City of Kingman) commented that changes to development policies could have significant economic impacts over the long-term, as well as impacts to traffic.
6. Upcoming Public Meeting Discussion
Details concerning the upcoming Public Meeting were discussed throughout the TAC progress meeting, including overall format and possible timeframes. The general consensus among the TAC and PB team was to hold a short evening presentation, followed by an open house with multiple display boards. It was decided to hold a Wednesday meeting at the City Hall chambers in mid June, preceded by a mailer to inform the public sent out as part of the monthly water bill.
 7. Next Meeting – Public Meeting: June 12th